



#18
J. Douglas
9/29/04

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: CHRISTOPHER J. LORD; § Group Art Unit: 2614
KARL O. LILLEVOLD; GIM §
DEISHER §
§
Serial No.: 09/448,679 §
§
Filed: November 24, 1999 §
§
For: NOISY EDGE REMOVAL FOR §
VIDEO TRANSMISSION § Atty. Dkt. No.: ITL.0252US (P7381)

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

AUG 26 2004

Technology Center 2600

REPLY BRIEF

Sir:

Applicants respectfully file this Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on June 17, 2004.

I. REPLY

In addition to the reasons set forth in Applicant's Appeal Brief, the appealed claims are patentable for the further reasons discussed herein.

Specifically, claim 1 is patentable for the further reason that nowhere does Lawlor teach that the data errors discussed therein are caused by noise. Furthermore, even if the data errors are somehow considered to be noise, Lawlor does not disclose identifying noise in a first portion of a video frame. In this regard, the portion of Lawlor relied upon by the Examiner (col. 13, ln. 57-col. 14, ln. 24) merely determines whether data elements are valid or invalid. Such validity or invalidity does not identify noise, at least because data may be invalid for myriad reasons. Thus,

Date of Deposit: August 16, 2004
I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Jennifer Juarez



there is no identification of noise in a first portion of a video frame in Lawlor. For these further reasons, claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable.

With respect to claims 2, 11, and 18, nowhere does the portion of Lawlor contended to meet these claims disclose associating a noise level with a first portion of a video frame. Instead, col. 12, lns. 44-64 of Lawlor merely discloses that checks are made to: determine a frequency range of a sub-band containing an error; determine whether errors exist in previous and subsequent frames (i.e., not the claimed video frame); and check for errors in elements surrounding a corrupted element. Claims 2, 11, 18 and the claims depending therefrom are thus further patentable, as Lawlor does not disclose associating a noise level with a first portion of a video frame.

Claims 7, 14, and 23 depend from claims 2, 11, and 18, respectively, and further recite that comparing the noise level to a predetermined value comprises associating the predetermined value to the type of video input signal. Again, the Examiner relies upon col. 13, ln. 57-col. 14, ln. 24 of Lawlor to contend anticipation. However, this portion of Lawlor nowhere discloses that a predetermined value is associated to a type of video signal. Instead, this portion of Lawlor merely discloses that the threshold level varies according to a spatial frequency range of a sub-band containing a corrupted element. Nowhere does this teach associating a predetermined value to a type of video input signal.

In addition to the reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, claim 9 is further patentable as Lawlor does not disclose a storage medium including a software program to perform as claimed in claim 9. In this regard, the Examiner admits that the error flag analyzer 760, contended to be a storage medium including a software program “is effectively a look-up table.” Answer, p. 6. However, a look-up table does not include a software program. Instead, as

disclosed in Lawlor based on inputs "which may be considered as the address inputs" the error flag analyzer provides two outputs. Lawlor col. 15, lns. 39-58. Accordingly, claim 9 and the claims depending therefrom are further patentable as the look-up table of Lawlor does not include a software program.

Regarding claim 25, the Examiner contends that FIGS. 15B-15E of Lawlor somehow disclose analyzing portions of a video frame with different adjacent portions. However, FIGS. 15D-15E of Lawlor are merely used to show selection of concealment coefficients based on error flags. These error flags are not portions of a video frame. Nor is there any analysis performed between different portions of a video frame with corresponding adjacent portions. Accordingly claim 25 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over Lawlor for this further reason.

II. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth herein, as well as set forth in the Appeal Brief, Applicants respectfully request that each of the final rejections be reversed and that the claims subject to this Appeal be allowed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 16, 2004



Mark J. Rozman
Registration No. 42,117
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024-1805
(512) 418-9944 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]



21906

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE



Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PTO/SB/21 (05-03)

Approved for use through 04/30/2003. OMB 0551-0031
Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

AP

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

Application Number

09/448,679

Filing Date

November 24, 1999

First Named Inventor

Christopher J. Lord

Group Art Unit

2614

Examiner Name

Trang U. Tran

Attorney Docket Number

ITL.0252US (P7381)

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

- Fee Transmittal Form
- Fee Attached
- Amendment / Response
- After Final
- Affidavits/declaration(s)
- Extension of Time Request
- Express Abandonment Request
- Information Disclosure Statement
- Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
- Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
- Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53

- Assignment Papers (for an Application)
- Drawing(s)
- Licensing-related Papers
- Petition
- Petition to Convert a Provisional Application
- Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence
- Terminal Disclaimer
- Request for Refund
- CD, Number of CD(s) _____

Remarks

- After Allowance Communication to Group
- Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
- Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
- Proprietary Information
- Status Letter
- Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
- Reply Brief (in triplicate)

RECEIVED

AUG 26 2004

Technology Center 2600



21906

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name

Mark J. Rozman, Reg. No. 42,117
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.

Signature

Date

August 16, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the

Typed or printed name

Jennifer Juarez

Signature

Date

August 16, 2004

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.